

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 11, 2007 and the Advisory Action dated December 12, 2007 have been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendments and following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-23 and 25-32 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-21 have been allowed, however Claims 1-32 are indicated as rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251. Claims 24-27 and 30-32 stand objected to. Claim 24 has been cancelled.

Applicants thank Examiner Artman and his Supervisor, Ed Glick for courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during a telephone interview conducted January 8, 2008. The content of the supplemental declaration and the markings of amended claims was discussed to clarify the deficiencies cited in the Advisory Action dated December 12, 2008.

The rejection of Claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 251 for having a defective oath and declaration is respectfully traversed. Applicants submit herewith a substitute reissue declaration to remove an error cited in the Office Action/Advisory Action. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the objection to the reissue oath/declaration be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 251 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to provide the appropriate markings in accordance with 37 CFR 1.173(d).

The rejection of Claims 22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Stergiopoulos (US Patent No. 6,236,705) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 24 has been cancelled, and independent Claim 22 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 24.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 22 is submitted as being patentable over Stergiopoulos.

Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 22. When the recitations of Claim 28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 22, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 28 likewise is patentable over Stergiopoulos.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 22 and 28 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stergiopoulos is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 24 has been cancelled, and independent Claim 22 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 24. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 22 is submitted as being patentable over Stergiopoulos.

Claim 23 depends from independent Claim 22. When the recitations of Claim 23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 22, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 23 likewise is patentable over Stergiopoulos.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 (a) rejection of Claim 23 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stergiopoulos in view of Meno (US Patent No. 4,716,904) is respectfully traversed.


Claim 24 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claim 24 has been cancelled, and independent Claim 22 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 24. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 22 is submitted as being patentable over Stergiopoulos.

Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 22. When the recitations of Claim 28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 22, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 28 likewise is patentable over Stergiopoulos.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 (a) rejection of Claim 28 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



William J. Zychlewicz  
Registration No.: 51,366  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070